arXiv:1104.2635v1 [math.NT] 13 Apr 2011

On a Problem Relating to the ABC Conjecture

Daniel M. Kane

January 19, 2013

1 Introduction

For an integer n, let $r(n) = \prod_{p|n} p$ be the product of its prime divisors. The ABC-Conjecture states that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there are only finitely many solutions to the equation $A + B + C = 0$ in relatively prime integers A, B, C so that $\max(|A|, |B|, |C|) > r(ABC)^{1+\epsilon}$. Although this conjecture is not known for any value of ϵ, when the restrictions on A, B, C are loosened there are conjectural predictions of the number of solutions that are more tractable. In particular:

Conjecture 1. *Given constants* $0 < a, b, c \leq 1$*, and* $\epsilon > 0$*, with* $a + b + c > 1$ *then for sufficiently large* N *the number of solutions to* $A + B + C = 0$ *in relatively prime integers* A, B, C *with* $|A|, |B|, |C| \leq N$ *and* $r(A) \leq |A|^a, r(B) \leq |B|^b, r(C) \leq |C|^c$ *is between* $N^{a+b+c-1-\epsilon}$ *and* $N^{a+b+c-1+\epsilon}$.

We will henceforth refer to the number of such triples A, B, C as the number of solutions to the ABC problem with parameters (a, b, c) or with parameters (a, b, c, N).

Conjecture 1 was stated (with slightly different terminology) in [2]. Furthermore, [2] alludes to a proof of this Conjecture in the case when $5/6 \leq a, b, c \leq 1$. We extend this result to a wider range of values. In particular, we show:

(Note: from this point onward when using an N^ϵ in asymptotic notation, it will be taken to mean that the bound holds for any $\epsilon > 0$, though the asymptotic constants may depend on ϵ.)

Theorem 1. *For* $0 < a, b, c \leq 1$*, with* $\min(a, b, c) + \max(a, b, c) > 1$*, the number of solutions to the ABC problem with parameters* (a, b, c, N) *is* $\Omega(N^{a+b+c-1})$.

Theorem 2. *For* $0 < a, b, c \leq 1$*, the number of solutions to the ABC problem with parameters* (a, b, c, N) *is* $O(N^{a+b+c-1+\epsilon} + N^{1+\epsilon})$.

Together these Theorems provide a proof of Conjecture 1 whenever $a+b+c \geq 2$.

We use two main techniques to prove these Theorems. First we use lattice methods. The idea is to fix the non-squarefree parts of A, B, C and to then count the number of solutions. For example if A, B, C have non-squarefree parts α, β, γ, we need to count solutions to an equation of the form $\alpha X + \beta Y + \gamma Z = 0$.

Secondly we use a result of Heath-Brown on the number of integer points on a conic. The idea here is to note that if A, B, C are highly divisible they are likely divisible by large squares. Writing $A = \alpha X^2, B = \beta Y^2, C = \gamma Z^2$, then for fixed values of α, β, γ the solutions to the ABC problem correspond to integer points of small size on a particular conic.

In Section 2 we cover the lattice methods. In particular, in Section 2.1, we use these methods to prove Theorem 1. The proof of our upper bound will involve breaking our argument into cases based upon the approximate sizes of various parameters of A, B, and C. In Section 2.2, we introduce some ideas and notation that we will use when making these arguments. In Section 2.3, we use lattice methods to prove an upper bound on the number of solutions. These techniques will work best when A, B, and C have relatively few repeated factors. In Section 3, we prove another upper bound, this time using our methods involving conics. These results will turn out to be most effective when A,B and C have many repeated factors. Finally, we combine these results with our upper bound from the previous Section to prove Theorem 2.

2 Lattice Methods

2.1 Lattice Lower Bounds

We begin with the following Lemma:

Lemma 3. *Let L be a two dimensional lattice and P a convex polygon. Let m be the minimum separation between points of L. Then*

$$|L \cap P| = \frac{\mathit{Volume}(P)}{\mathit{CoVolume}(L)} + O\left(\frac{\mathit{Perimeter}(P)}{m} + 1\right).$$

Proof. Begin with a reduced basis of L. We apply a linear transformation to the problem so that L is a square lattice. We can do this since this operation has no effect on $|L \cap P|$ or $\frac{\text{Volume}(P)}{\text{CoVolume}(L)}$ and increases $\frac{\text{Perimeter}(P)}{m}$ by at most a constant factor. We now note that if we draw a fundamental domain around each point of $|L \cap P|$, their union is sandwiched between the set of points within distance $\sqrt{2}m$ of P, and the set of points where the disc of radius $\sqrt{2}m$ around them is contained in P. Computing the areas of these two regions gives our result. $\square$

We are now prepared to prove our lower bound.

proof of Theorem 1. Assume without loss of generality that $a \leq b \leq c$. We have by assumption that $a + c > 1$.

Pick x, y, z the smallest possible integers so that $2^{x-1} > N^{1-a}$, $3^{y-1} > N^{1-b}$, $5^{z-1} > N^{1-c}$. We will attempt to find solutions of the form $A = X2^x, B = Y3^y, C = Z5^z$. Let L be the lattice of triples of integers A, B, C so that $A + B + C = 0$, $2^x|A$, $3^y|B$, $5^z|C$. Let L_n be the sublattice of L so that $n|A, B, C$. Using an appropriate normalization of the volume of the plane $A + B + C = 0$, the covolume of L is $U := 2^x 3^y 5^z = \Theta(N^{3-a-b-c})$. The covolume of L_n is

$n^2U/\gcd(n,30)$. Let v be the shortest vector in L. Let $m = |v|$. Let M be the length of the shortest vector which is not a multiple of v. Note that the vectors $(0, 3^y5^z, -3^y5^z), (2^x5^z, 0, -2^x5^z)$ are in L and are linearly independent. Therefore M is at most the larger of the lengths of these vectors so $M = O(N^{1-\delta})$ for some $\delta > 0$. Note also that $U = \Theta(mM)$.

Let P be the polygon in the plane $A+B+C = 0$ defined by $|A|, |B|, |C| \leq N$. The number of solutions to the ABC problem with parameters (a, b, c, N) is at least the number of points in $L \cap P$ with relatively prime coordinates. This is

$$\sum_n \mu(n)|L_n \cap P|.$$

Removing the points that are multiples of v we get

$$\sum_{n=1}^{O(N/M)} \mu(n)|L_n \cap P \backslash \langle v\rangle|.$$

(We can stop the sum at $O(N/M)$ since if $w \in L_n$ for n squarefree, then $w/(n/\gcd(n,30)) \in L$ and all points of L not a multiple of v are of norm at least M) Letting V be the volume of P and noting that the shortest vector in L_n has length $\Theta(nm)$, the above equals

$$\sum_{n=1}^{O(N/M)} \left(\frac{\mu(n)\gcd(n,30)}{n^2}\right)\left(\frac{V}{U}\right) + O(N/(nm)+1).$$

The main term is

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{V}{U}\right)\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\mu(n)\gcd(n,30)}{n^2} + O(M/N)\right) &= \Theta\left(\frac{V}{U}\right)\\ &= \Theta\left(\frac{N^2}{N^{3-a-b-c}}\right)\\ &= \Theta(N^{a+b+c-1}).\end{aligned}$$

The error term is

$$\begin{aligned}O(\log(N)N/m + N/M) &= O(\log(N)NM/U + N/\sqrt{U})\\ &= O(\log(N)N^{a+b+c-1-\delta} + N^{(a+b+c-1)/2}).\end{aligned}$$

This completes our proof. □

2.2 Dyadic Intervals

Before beginning our work on upper bounds, we discuss some ideas involving dyadic intervals that we will make use of. First a definition:

Definition. *A dyadic interval is an interval of the form* $[2^n, 2^{n+1}]$ *for some integer* n.

In the process of proving upper bounds we will often wish to count the number of solutions to an ABC problem in which some functions of A, B, C lie in fixed dyadic intervals. We may for example claim that the number of solutions to an ABC problem where $f(A), f(B), f(C)$ lie in fixed dyadic intervals is $O(X)$. Here f will be some specified function and we are claiming that for any triple of dyadic intervals I_A, I_B, I_C the number of A, B, C that are solutions to the appropriate ABC problem and so that additionally $f(A) \in I_A, f(B) \in I_B$ and $f(C) \in I_C$ is $O(X)$. When we do this, it will often be the case that X depends on $f(A), f(B), f(C)$ and not just the parameters of the original ABC problem we were trying to solve. By this we mean that our upper bound is valid if the $f(A), f(B), f(C)$ appearing in it are replaced by any numbers in the appropriate dyadic intervals. Generally this freedom will not matter since fixing dyadic intervals for $f(A), f(B), f(C)$ already fixes their values up to a multiplicative constant. It should also be noted that $[1, N]$ can be covered by $O(\log N)$ dyadic intervals. Thus if we prove bounds on the number of solutions in which a finite number of parameters (each at most N) lie in fixed dyadic intervals, we obtain an upper bound for the number of solutions with no such restrictions that is at most N^ϵ larger than the bound for the worst set of intervals.

2.3 Lattice Upper Bounds

In order to prove upper bounds, we will need a slightly different form of Lemma 3.

Lemma 4. *Let L be a 2 dimensional lattice and P a convex polygon, centrally symmetric about the origin. Then the number of vectors in $L \cap P$ which are not positive integer multiples of other vectors in L is*

$$O\left(\frac{\mathit{Volume}(P)}{\mathit{CoVolume}(L)} + 1\right).$$

Proof. If $L \cap P$ only contains the origin or multiples of a single vector, the result follows trivially. Otherwise P contains two linearly independent vectors of L. This means that P contains at least half of some fundamental domain. Therefore $2P$ contains some whole fundamental domain. Therefore $4P$ contains all of the fundamental domains centered at any of the points in $L \cap P$. Therefore $|L \cap P| = O\left(\frac{\text{Volume}(P)}{\text{CoVolume}(L)}\right)$. $\square$

We will also make extensive use of the following proposition:

Proposition 5. *For any m, the number of k with $|k| \leq N$ and $r(k) = m$ is $O(N^\epsilon)$, where the implied constant depends on ϵ but not N or m.*

Proof. Let $m = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_n$, where $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_n$ are primes (if m is not squarefree we have no solutions). Then all such k must be of the form $\prod_{i=1}^n p_i^{a_i}$ for some integers $a_i \geq 1$ with $\sum_i a_i \log(p_i) \leq \log(N)$. Note that if for each such k you consider the unit cube defined by $\prod_{i=1}^n [a_i - 1, a_i] \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, these cubes have disjoint interiors and are contained in a simplex of volume $\frac{1}{n!}\prod_i \frac{\log(N)}{\log(p_i)}$. Hence the number of such k is at most

$$\frac{1}{n!}\prod_i \frac{\log(N)}{\log(p_i)} = O\left(\frac{\log(N)}{n}\right)^n.$$

Now we must also have that $n! \leq \prod_i p_i \leq N$ or there will be no solutions, so $n = O\left(\frac{\log(N)}{\log\log(N)}\right)$. Now $n \log N - n \log n$ is increasing for $n < N/e$ so the number of solutions is at most

$$\begin{aligned} O\left(\frac{\log(N)}{\log(N)/\log\log(N)}\right)^{O\left(\frac{\log(N)}{\log\log(N)}\right)} &= \exp\left(O\left(\frac{\log(N)\log\log\log(N)}{\log\log(N)}\right)\right) \\ &= O(N^\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

□

We now need some more definitions. For an integer n define

$$u(n) := \prod_{p||n} p$$

to be the product of primes that divide n exactly once. Let

$$e(n) := \prod_{p^\alpha||n, \alpha>1} p^\alpha = n/u(n)$$

be the product of primes dividing n more than once counted with their appropriate multiplicity. Finally, let

$$v(n) = \prod_{p^2|n} p = r(n)/u(n) = r(e(n))$$

be the product of primes dividing n more than once.

We can now prove the first part of our upper bound

Proposition 6. *Fix $0 < a, b, c \leq 1$. The number of solutions to the ABC problem with parameters (a, b, c, N) and with $v(A), v(B), v(C)$ lying in fixed dyadic intervals is*

$$O(N^{a+b+c-1+\epsilon} + v(A)v(B)v(C)N^\epsilon).$$

Note that since $v(A), v(B), v(C) \leq \sqrt{N}$, this would already give a weaker but non-trivial version of Theorem 2.

Proof. We will begin by additionally fixing dyadic intervals for $|A|, |B|, |C|$, $u(A)$, $u(B), u(C)$, $e(A), e(B), e(C)$. Since there are only $\log(N)$ possible intervals for each, our total number of solutions will be greater by a factor of at most a factor of $O(N^\epsilon)$. Assume without loss of generality that $|A| \leq |B| \leq |C|$.

There are $O(v(A)v(B)v(C))$ ways to fix the values of $v(A), v(B), v(C)$ within their respective dyadic intervals. Given these, by Proposition 5 there are $O(N^{\epsilon})$ possible values of $e(A), e(B), e(C)$. Pick a triple of values for $e(A), e(B), e(C)$. We assume these are relatively prime, for otherwise they could not correspond to any valid solutions to our ABC problem. Define the lattice L to consist of triples of integers which sum to 0, and are divisible by $e(A), e(B), e(C)$ respectively. We define the polygon P to be the set of (x_1, x_2, x_3) so that $x_1+x_2+x_3=0$ and $|x_1|$ is bounded by the upper end of the dyadic interval for $|A|$, and $|x_2|, |x_3|$ are likewise bounded by the intervals for $|B|$ and $|C|$. The number of solutions to our ABC problem with the specified values of $e(A), e(B), e(C)$ and with $|A|, |B|, |C|$ in the appropriate dyadic intervals is at most the number of vectors in $L \cap P$ that are not positive integer multiples of other vectors in L. By Lemma 4 this is

$$O\left(\frac{\text{Volume}(P)}{\text{CoVolume}(L)}+1\right) = O\left(\frac{|AB|}{e(A)e(B)e(C)}+1\right).$$

Multiplying this by the number of ways we had to choose values for $v(A)$, $v(B)$, $v(C)$, $e(A), e(B), e(C)$, we get that the total number of solutions to our original ABC problem with the specified dyadic intervals for $|A|, v(A), e(A)$, etc. is at most

$$\begin{aligned} &O\left(\frac{N^{\epsilon}|ABC|v(A)v(B)v(C)}{e(A)e(B)e(C)|C|}+N^{\epsilon}v(A)v(B)v(C)\right)\\ &= O\left(\frac{N^{\epsilon}r(A)r(B)r(C)}{|C|}+N^{\epsilon}v(A)v(B)v(C)\right)\\ &\leq O(N^{\epsilon}|A|^a|B|^b|C|^{c-1}+N^{\epsilon}v(A)v(B)v(C)).\end{aligned}$$

Where the last step comes from noting that for any solution to our ABC problem, $r(A) \leq |A|^a$, etc. Since $a+b+c>1$, $|A^aB^bC^{c-1}|$ is maximized with respect to $N \geq |C| \geq |B| \geq |A|$ when $|A| = |B| = |C| = N$. So we obtain the bound

$$O(N^{a+b+c-1+\epsilon}+N^{\epsilon}v(A)v(B)v(C)).$$

□

3 Points on Conics

The bound from Proposition 6 is useful so long as $v(A), v(B), v(C)$ are not too big. When they are large, we shall use different techniques. In particular, if $v(A), v(B), v(C)$ are large, then A, B, C are divisible by large squares. We will fix non-square parts of these numbers and bound the number of solutions using a Theorem from [1]

Theorem 7 ([1] Theorem 2)**.** *Let q be an integral ternary quadratic form with matrix M. Let $\Delta = |\det M|$, and assume that $\Delta \neq 0$. Write Δ_0 for the highest common factor of the 2×2 minors of M. Then the number of primitive integer* *solutions of $q(x) = 0$ in the box $|x_i| \leq Ri$ is*

$$\ll \{1 + (\frac{R_1 R_2 R_3 \Delta_0^2}{\Delta})^{1/2}\} d_3(\Delta).$$

Where $d_3(\Delta)$ is the number of ways of writing Δ as a product of three integers.

Putting this into a form that fits our needs slightly better:

Corollary 8. *For a, b, c relatively prime integers, the number of solutions to $aX^2 + bY^2 + cZ^2 = 0$ in relatively prime integers X, Y, Z with $|X| \leq R_1$, $|Y| \leq R_2$, $|Z| \leq R_3$ is*

$$O\left(\left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{R_1 R_2 R_3}{|abc|}}\right)(|abc|)^{\epsilon}\right).$$

Proof. This follows immediately from applying the above Theorem to the obvious quadratic form, noting that $\Delta = |abc|$, $\Delta_0 = 1$ and that $d_3(N) = O(N^{\epsilon})$. $\square$

We now have all of the machinery ready to prove the upper bound. We make one final pair of definitions.

Let

$$S(n) := \prod_{p^{\alpha} || n} p^{[\alpha/2]} = \sup\{m : m^2 | n\}.$$

be the largest number whose square divides n. Let

$$T(n) = |n/S(n)^2|.$$

We use Corollary 8 to prove another upper bound.

Proposition 9. *Fix dyadic intervals for $S(A), T(A), S(B), T(B), S(C)$, and $T(C)$. The number of solutions of the ABC problem with S and T of A, B, C lying in these intervals is*

$$O\left(\left(T(A)T(B)T(C) + \sqrt{S(A)S(B)S(C)T(A)T(B)T(C)}\right) N^{\epsilon}\right).$$

Proof. There are $O(T(A)T(B)T(C))$ choices for the values of $T(A), T(B), T(C)$ lying in their appropriate intervals. Fixing these values, we count the number of solutions to

$$\pm T(A)S(A)^2 \pm T(B)S(B)^2 \pm T(C)S(C)^2 = 0$$

with $S(A), S(B), S(C)$ relatively prime and in the appropriate intervals. By Corollary 8 this is at most

$$O\left(\left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{S(A)S(B)S(C)}{T(A)T(B)T(C)}}\right) N^{\epsilon}\right).$$

Hence the total number of solutions to our ABC problem with $T(A), S(A)$, etc. lying in appropriate intervals is

$$O\left(\left(T(A)T(B)T(C)+\sqrt{S(A)S(B)S(C)T(A)T(B)T(C)}\right)N^{\epsilon}\right).$$

□

We are now prepared to prove our upper bound on the number of solutions to an ABC problem.

Proof of Theorem 2. It is enough to prove our Theorem after fixing $S(A)$, $T(A)$, $v(A)$, $S(B), T(B), v(B)$, $S(C), T(C), v(C)$ to all lie in fixed dyadic intervals, since there are only $O(\log(N)^9) = O(N^{\epsilon})$ choices of these intervals. It should be noted that $S(n) \geq v(n)$ for all n. By Proposition 6 we have the number of solutions is at most

$$O\left(N^{a+b+c-1+\epsilon}+S(A)S(B)S(C)N^{\epsilon}\right).$$

By Proposition 9, noting that $N \geq T(A)S(A)^2, T(B)S(B)^2, T(C)S(C)^2$, we know that the number of solutions is at most

$$O\left(N^{3+\epsilon}(S(A)S(B)S(C))^{-2}+N^{3/2+\epsilon}(S(A)S(B)S(C))^{-1/2}\right).$$

If $S(A)S(B)S(C) \geq N$ this latter bound is $O(N^{1+\epsilon})$ and if $S(A)S(B)S(C) \leq N$, the former bound is $O(N^{a+b+c-1+\epsilon}+N^{1+\epsilon})$. So in either case we have our desired bound. □

4 Conclusion

We have proven several bounds on the number of solutions to ABC type problems. In particular we have proven the Conjecture 1 so long as $a+b+c \geq 2$.

Our lower bounds can not be extended by this technique because if a, b, c are much smaller we will not be guaranteed that the lattices we look at will have anything more than multiples of their shortest vector in the range we are concerned with.

Our upper bounds likely cannot be extended much either, because when $S(A)S(B)S(C) \sim N$, then Corollary 8 only says that we have $O(N^{\epsilon})$ solutions for each choice of the T's. To do better than this, we would need to show that for some reasonable fraction of T's that there were no solutions.

Acknowledgements

This work was done with the support of NSF and NDSEG graduate fellowships. I would also like to thank Noam Elkies for suggesting the use of Heath-Brown's bound for points on a conic.

References

[1] D.R. Heath-Brown *The Density of Rational Points on Cubic Surfaces* Acta Arith. 79 (1997), no. 1, 1730.

[2] Barry Mazur *Questions about Powers of Numbers* Notices of the AMS, 47 (2000), no. 2, 195-202.